

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Application Number 2001/0049672 by Moore et al. (referred to herein as “Moore”) in view of United States Patent Number 6,442,592 to Alumbaugh et al. (referred to herein as “Alumbaugh”). Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are not rendered obvious by Moore for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites a method of updating Web pages of an e-commerce storefront comprising (emphasis added):

accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site;
submitting log in information to the Web site, wherein said log in information is for providing privileges sufficient to enable editing of the Web site, wherein said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an intranet link, and wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet;

invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the Web page;
selecting an item on the Web page to modify;
editing the item on the Web page;
submitting the edited item to the Web site; and
receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Page 3 of the rejection states that Moore fails to teach or suggest providing log in information over an intranet link. Applicant concurs and respectfully asserts that Moore also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an intranet link” and “wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that Alumbaugh, either alone or in combination with Moore, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an intranet link” and “wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet” as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, log in information is submitted over an intranet link (e.g., 131 as shown in Figure 1 of the present application) which is separate from the Internet (e.g., 150 as shown in Figure 1 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant understands Alumbaugh to teach an intranet which is not separate from the Internet. For example, as shown in Figure 1 of Alumbaugh, intranet 110 and Internet 104 overlap. Furthermore, Alumbaugh teaches that “users within intranet 110 may connect to message center server 102 by logging on from a workstation 112a connected through internet 104” (col. 3, lines 36-40). Therefore, Alumbaugh teaches that intranet 110 and Internet 104 are not separate by teaching that communications within intranet 110 are sent through internet 104.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Moore in view of Alumbaugh, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 8 and 15 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are allowable.

Claims 6, 13 and 20

Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Moore in view of Alumbaugh and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,785,721 to Immerman et al. (hereafter referred to as

“Immerman”). Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 13 and 20 are not rendered obvious by Moore in view of Alumbaugh and further in view of Immerman for the following reasons.

Page 5 of the rejection state that Moore and/or Alumbaugh fail to teach or suggest the limitations of “submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page,” “submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page,” and “wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level” as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 13 and 20. Applicant concurs.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Immerman, either alone or in combination with Moore and/or Alumbaugh, fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page,” “submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page,” and “wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level” as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 13 and 20. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understands Immerman to merely teach an access control list that specifies that level of access that users and servers have to a database (line 66 of col. 19 to line 1 of col. 20). However, this does not amount to a teaching of submitting log

in information to obtain a privilege level *for editing a web page* as claimed. Further, Immerman fails to teach or suggest a first and second privilege level each enabling the editing of a different number of items of the web page as claimed.

Further, although page 2 of the rejection states that “Immerman teaches different level [sic] of privilege for access... and the primary reference Moore teaches editing a web page,” Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited Moore/Alumbaugh/Immerman combination fails to teach or suggest a first log in information *and a second log in information* as claimed. Additionally, the cited Moore/Alumbaugh/Immerman combination fails to teach or suggest such a first and second log in information *each associated with a different privilege level* as claimed. Further, the cited Moore/Alumbaugh/Immerman combination fails to teach or suggest the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level as claimed.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that that Immerman, either alone or in combination with Moore and/or Alumbaugh, fails to cure the deficiencies of the cited Moore/Alumbaugh combination discussed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Immerman also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an intranet link” and “wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet” as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15.

Since Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 6, 13 and 20 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 6, 13 and 20 are allowable.

Claims 7, 14 and 21

Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Moore in view of Alumbaugh and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,643,663 to Dabney et al. (hereafter referred to as “Dabney”). Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 14 and 21 are not rendered obvious by Moore in view of Alumbaugh and further in view of Dabney for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that that Dabney, either alone or in combination with Moore and/or Alumbaugh, fails to cure the deficiencies of the cited Moore/Alumbaugh combination discussed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Dabney also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said submitting said log in information further comprises submitting said log in information over an intranet link” and “wherein said intranet link is separate from the Internet” as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Since Claims 7, 14 and 21 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 7, 14 and 21 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 7, 14 and 21 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 10 / 1 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060